

MINUTES
TRAVERSE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Study Session

TUESDAY, October 20, 2015

7:30 P.M.

COMMISSION CHAMBERS
Governmental Center, 2nd Floor
400 Boardman Avenue
Traverse City, Michigan 49684

PRESENT: Vice-Chairperson Jody Bergman, Commissioners Michael Dow, Jeanine Easterday, Janet Fleshman, Chairperson John Serratelli, Commissioners Bill Twietmeyer, Janice Warren and Tim Werner

ABSENT: Commissioner Linda Koebert

STAFF PRESENT: Russ Soyryng, Planning Director; Missy Luick, Planning and Engineering Assistant

1. **CALL MEETING TO ORDER-** Chairperson Serratelli called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.
2. **ROLL CALL**
3. **ANNOUNCEMENTS-** None.
4. **REVIEW OF SECTION 1368.03 LOT WIDTH, LOT AREA, IMPERVIOUS SURFACE AND DENSITY REQUIREMENTS (DISCUSSION)**

Chairperson Serratelli reminded the Commission that this item came up during the discussion regarding the redevelopment of Immaculate Conception School.

Mr. Soyryng briefly explained the history of impervious surface limits. Impervious surface limits were added to the zoning code in 1999 to establish limits to utilize properties better (i.e. limit parking areas and building mass). Amendments over the years were added to incentivize affordable housing or for using green roofs or porous pavement. An amendment was made several years ago for places of worship to increase the impervious surface allowance to 70% because it was determined that it was important to keep places of worship in the city limits.

Swimming pools, sidewalks, plazas, tennis courts are not counted against the impervious surface limit.

Commission discussion included the concept of dividing buildings from parking. Possibly look into regulating parking areas with parking maximums. The existing stormwater ordinance handles how stormwater is handled on site. Perhaps look into adding incentives

to projects (ex. Larger building footprint, or more surface parking allowances) that exceed the requirements of the stormwater ordinance.

Mr. Soyering discussed that the impervious surface limits in the multi-family dwelling districts often limit potential developments and that it may be worthwhile looking into adjusting the impervious surface limits for multi-family. Mr. Soyering also discussed that some of the intent of the impervious surface limits were for “neighborhood character”. Perhaps that can be achieved by requiring landscape requirements.

The Commission discussed the concept of possibly designating schools as campus areas that are subject to Master Site and Facilities Plans.

Commission consensus was that it is important to keep schools in the city limits. The Commission would like to move forward considering a text amendment to increase the impervious surface limit for schools with similar language to the amendment that was previously approved that increased the impervious surface limit for places of worship. In the future, the Commission would like to establish a committee to look into studying impervious surface limitations in the residential districts.

The following addressed the Commission:

- Scott Jozwiak, city business owner, made general comments

5. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN- PRIORITIZING EXERCISE (DISCUSSION)

Chairperson Serratelli explained that the Planning Commission will see a Capital Improvement Plan this year that looks a lot different from past years. We will review a Capital Improvement Plan that lists projects and their proposed fiscal year for implementation, but it will not include monetary components. The Capital Improvement Plan is a strategic planning document and is meant to be a document that sets priorities for the future and implements the City’s Master Plan.

Mr. Soyering stated that the Michigan Planning Enabling Act states that the Planning Commission shall prepare and adopt a Capital Improvement Plan. The Planning Commission should set general order of priorities for planned projects within the six-year Capital Improvement Plan. In the past, the Capital Improvement Plan has been an elaborate “wish list” and has not served as an effective strategic document. It is our hope that the Plan can be used for strategic planning for the City.

Chairperson Serratelli explained that Steve Constantin, DDA Board Member, led the DDA through a prioritization exercise using paired comparisons a few years ago and has offered to explain the process to the Planning Commission.

The following addressed the Commission:

- Steve Constantin, 223 Midtown Dr., city resident explained a paired comparison process that the DDA used to establish project priorities

Commissioner Twietmeyer left the meeting at 8:53 p.m.

The Planning Commission reviewed a paired comparison document to establish priorities for project categories within the Capital Improvement Program. The Planning Commission will fill out the spreadsheet as a homework assignment. Staff will tabulate results. The result will be discussed at a future meeting.

6. **PUBLIC COMMENT-** None.

7. **ADJOURNMENT-** The meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

November 3, 2015

Jan Warren _{PS}

Jan Warren, Secretary

